APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/426,418	10/25/1999	STEPHAN ERICKSON	AMAZON.010A	1857

7590   10/06/2003

FITCH, EVEN, TANIN & FLANNERY
120 south lasalle street
suite 1600
chicago, IL   60603-3406

EXAMINER
SINGH, RACHNA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/426,418	ERICKSON ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Rachna Singh	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25 October 1999</u> .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-29</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-29</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>2</u> .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: Application filed 10/25/99.

2.   Claims 1-29 are pending. Claims 1, 11, 16, and 25 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-9, 11, 13-18, 25-27, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Nguyen et al., US Patent 5,737,592, 4/7/98 in view of Iizuka et

al., US Patent 6,424,980, 7/23/02 (filed 6/9/99) and Washington et al., US Patent

6,515,682, 2/4/03 (filed 5/9/96).

In reference to claim 1, Nguyen teaches a method for executing SQL queries in a

relational database management system in which a user requests information using

HTML input forms, which request is then used to create an SQL statement for execution

by the RDBMS software. The results output by the RDBMS system are transformed

into HTML format for presentation to the web user. Nguyen's system comprises the

following:

-Having a user manipulate an HTML input form via a web browser by selecting functions

and/or entering data into input boxes.

-Receiving the input form, extracting information, and substituting the inputs into an SQL

query

-Outputting the results of the query into the macro language file that is then translated

into an HTML report form for presentation to the user.

Nguyen teaches constructing a wrapper to obtain information from a database.

While Nguyen does not specifically teach constructing the wrapper for semi-structured

information; Iizuka does.

Iizuka teaches an integrated retrieval scheme for retrieving semi-structured

documents. Iizuka teaches using an input form to obtain information item by item by

retrieving information involved in the HTML documents. The user enters search items

and search conditions into an input form that is then used to retrieve the semi-structured

information from a repository. The 'semi-structured" information is extracted according

to the structural relationships. See columns 13-14. It would have been obvious to

combine Nguyen's input form for selecting functions and entering data into Iizuka's

system of inputting a form to retrieve semi-structured information since both Nguyen

and Iizuka are concerned with information retrieval with an input form defining search

criteria or functions. See abstract of Nguyen and Iizuka in which they disclose using

input forms to extract information.

Nguyen and Iizuka do not teach displaying a graphical representation of the

wrapper in which operations are depicted as objects on a display screen; however,

Washington does. Washington teaches a method for editing a control utilizing a

preview window to view changes made to the control. He teaches that the control is

displayed in a preview window and changes made to the control are reflected in the

window. Washington further teaches that the standard interface compliant control is

conceptualized as a "wrapper" around the internal control objects which allow the container to interact with the internal control objects reflected in the preview window. It would have been obvious to combine Washington's graphical display feature to the system of Nguyen/Iizuka since all three are concerned with information extraction. Moreover, Washington teaches displaying a wrapper and its functions (taught by Iizuka) in a graphical representation in which changes to controls are reflected in the window via objects. See column 6 and abstract of Washington.

In reference to claim 2, Nguyen teaches allowing a user to select functions through the browser. Iizuka's system uses link data to a semi-structured document. See column 36. It would have been obvious to combine Nguyen's input form for selecting functions and entering data into Iizuka's system of inputting a form to retrieve semi-structured information since both Nguyen and Iizuka are concerned with information retrieval with an input form defining search criteria or functions. See abstract of Nguyen and Iizuka in which they disclose using input forms to extract information.

In reference to claim 3, Nguyen and Iizuka do not teach displaying a graphical representation of the wrapper in which operations are depicted as objects on a display screen; however, Washington does. Washington teaches a method for editing a control utilizing a preview window to view changes made to the control. He teaches that the control is displayed in a preview window and changes made to the control are reflected in the window. Washington further teaches that the standard interface compliant control is conceptualized as a "wrapper" around the internal control objects which allow the

container to interact with the internal control objects reflected in the preview window. It would have been obvious to combine Washington's graphical display feature to the system of Nguyen/Iizuka since all three are concerned with information extraction. Moreover, Washington teaches displaying a wrapper and its functions (taught by Iizuka) in a graphical representation in which changes to controls are reflected in the window via objects. See column 6 and abstract of Washington.

In reference to claim 4, Nguyen teaches extracting information from a database; however, Iizuka teaches extracting information from web resources. See columns 1-2. It would have been obvious to combine Nguyen's input form for selecting functions and entering data into Iizuka's system of inputting a form to retrieve semi-structured information from web resources since both Nguyen and Iizuka are concerned with information retrieval with an input form defining search criteria or functions. See abstract of Nguyen and Iizuka in which they disclose using input forms to extract information.

In reference to claim 5, Nguyen/Iizuka/Washington teach having a variety of functions that provide various capabilities such as that of matching a regular expression. See columns 5-6 in which Iizuka teaches matching items to text data. . It would have been obvious to combine Washington's graphical display feature to the system of Nguyen/Iizuka since all three are concerned with information extraction. Moreover, Washington teaches displaying a wrapper and its functions (taught by Iizuka) in a graphical representation in which changes to controls are reflected in the window via objects. See column 6 and abstract of Washington.

In reference to claim 6, Nguyen does not teach outputting the extracted data in a structured format; however, Iizuka does. Iizuka teaches outputting semi-structured extracted data in the presentation chosen by the user which may be in structured format. See column 30 in which Iizuka teaches retrieving information item by item and displaying them accordingly. It would have been obvious to combine Nguyen's input form for selecting functions and entering data into Iizuka's system of inputting a form to retrieve semi-structured information since both Nguyen and Iizuka are concerned with information retrieval with an input form defining search criteria or functions. See abstract of Nguyen and Iizuka in which they disclose using input forms to extract information.

In reference to claims 7-9, Nguyen does not teach graphically depicting execution of the wrapper. Iizuka teaches displaying the extracted data as output of the wrapper. See columns 2-4. Nguyen and Iizuka do not teach displaying a graphical representation of the wrapper in which operations are depicted as objects on a display screen; however, Washington does. Washington teaches a method for editing a control utilizing a preview window to view changes made to the control. He teaches that the control is displayed in a preview window and changes made to the control are reflected in the window. Washington further teaches that the standard interface compliant control is conceptualized as a "wrapper" around the internal control objects which allow the container to interact with the internal control objects reflected in the preview window. It would have been obvious to combine Washington's graphical display feature to the system of Nguyen/Iizuka since all three are concerned with information extraction.

Moreover, Washington teaches displaying a wrapper and its functions (taught by Iizuka) in a graphical representation in which changes to controls are reflected in the window via objects. See column 6 and abstract of Washington.

Claim 11 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 2 above.

In reference to claim 14, the system of Nguyen/Iizuka/Washington teaches using a graphic design to identify information in websites. See columns 1-2 of Iizuka. It would have been obvious to combine Nguyen's input form for selecting functions and entering data into Iizuka's system of inputting a form to retrieve semi-structured information since both Nguyen and Iizuka are concerned with information retrieval with an input form defining search criteria or functions. See abstract of Nguyen and Iizuka in which they disclose using input forms to extract information.

Claims 13 and 15 are rejected under the same rationale as claim 6 above.

Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under the same rationale as claims 1 and 4 respectively above.

In reference to claim 18, Iizuka teaches using a table display to display information extracted from websites. See columns 13-14. It would have been obvious to combine Nguyen's input form for selecting functions and entering data into Iizuka's system of inputting a form to retrieve semi-structured information since both Nguyen and Iizuka are concerned with information retrieval with an input form defining search criteria or functions. See abstract of Nguyen and Iizuka in which they disclose using input forms to extract information.

Claim 25 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1 above.

Claim 26 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 2 above.

In reference to claim 27, Nguyen/Iizuka/Washington's system allows the user to

provide various functions for controlling the wrapper. The user can indicate changes to

the control which may comprise of starting, stopping, or setting breakpoints. See

abstract of Washington and Iizuka. It would have been obvious to combine

Washington's graphical display feature to the system of Nguyen/Iizuka since all three

are concerned with information extraction. Moreover, Washington teaches displaying a

wrapper and its functions (taught by Iizuka) in a graphical representation in which

changes to controls are reflected in the window via objects. See column 6 and abstract

of Washington.

Claim 29 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 6 above.

5.   Claims 10, 12, 19-24, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Nguyen et al., US Patent 5,737,592, 4/7/98 in view of Iizuka et al.,

US Patent 6,424,980, 7/23/02 (filed 6/9/99) and Washington et al., US Patent

6,515,682, 2/4/03 (filed 5/9/96), as applied to claims 1, 11, 16, and 25 above, and

further in view of Baker et al., US Patent 6,611,498, 8/26/03 (filed 9/24/98).

In reference to claim 10, Nguyen/Iizuka/Washington do not teach performing a

statistical analysis on the output; however, Baker teaches a system in which users can

run statistical analysis on extracted data. See abstract. It would have been obvious to

combine Baker with the system of Nguyen/Iizuka/Washington since they are concerned

with extracted data from a website.

Claim 28 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 10 above.

In reference to claim 12, Nguyen/Iizuka/Washington do not teach debugging the wrapper; however, Baker teaches debugging of customized rules. See abstract. . It would have been obvious to combine Baker with the system of Nguyen/Iizuka/Washington since they are concerned with extracted data from a website.

In reference to claims 19-20, Nguyen/Iizuka/Washington do not teach debugging the wrapper; however, Baker teaches debugging of customized rules. See abstract. . It would have been obvious to combine Baker with the system of Nguyen/Iizuka/Washington since they are concerned with extracted data from a website.

In reference to claim 21, Nguyen does not teach outputting the extracted data in a structured format; however, Iizuka does. Iizuka teaches outputting semi-structured extracted data in the presentation chosen by the user which may be in structured format. See column 30 in which Iizuka teaches retrieving information item by item and displaying them accordingly. It would have been obvious to combine Nguyen's input form for selecting functions and entering data into Iizuka's system of inputting a form to retrieve semi-structured information since both Nguyen and Iizuka are concerned with information retrieval with an input form defining search criteria or functions. See abstract of Nguyen and Iizuka in which they disclose using input forms to extract information. It would have been obvious to combine Baker with the system of Nguyen/Iizuka/Washington since they are concerned with extracted data from a website.

In reference to claims 22 and 23, Nguyen/Iizuka/Washington's system allows the

user to provide various functions for controlling the wrapper. The user can indicate

changes to the control which may comprise of starting, stopping, or setting breakpoints.

See abstract of Washington and Iizuka. It would have been obvious to combine

Washington's graphical display feature to the system of Nguyen/Iizuka since all three

are concerned with information extraction. Moreover, Washington teaches displaying a

wrapper and its functions (taught by Iizuka) in a graphical representation in which

changes to controls are reflected in the window via objects. See column 6 and abstract

of Washington.

In reference to claim 24, the system of Nguyen/Iizuka/Washington teaches using

a graphic design to identify information in websites. See columns 1-2 of Iizuka. It would

have been obvious to combine Nguyen's input form for selecting functions and entering

data into Iizuka's system of inputting a form to retrieve semi-structured information since

both Nguyen and Iizuka are concerned with information retrieval with an input form

defining search criteria or functions. See abstract of Nguyen and Iizuka in which they

disclose using input forms to extract information.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record but not relied upon:

Ashish, Naveen and Craig Knoblock. "Wrapper Generation for Semi-Structured Internet
Sources", SIGMOD Record, Vol. 26, No. 4, December 1997.

US Patent 6,606,625   Muslea et al.

US Patent 6,102,969   Christianson et al.

US Patent 5,826,258   Gupta et al.

US Patent 6,571,243   Gupta et al.

US Patent 6,516,308   Cohen et al.

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rachna Singh whose telephone number is 703.305.1952. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-5).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on 703.305.9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703.305.3900.

RS
9/29/03

HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100